81A

81A

THE JESUITS:

Their Apologists and their Enemies.

A LECTURE

Delivered in St. Patrick's Church, Ottawa,

Sunday Evening, February 24th, 1889.

BY

REV. M. J. WHELAN.

101
1355

THE JESUITS:

Their Apologists and their Enemies.

A LECTURE

Delivered in St. Patrick's Church, Ottawa,

Sunday Evening, February 24th, 1889.

—BY—

REV. M. J. WHELAN.

THE JESUITS.

What Religious Orders Are

Religious orders, or associations of men or women in the Catholic Church, were first established in the early part of the third century. The common bond of union among all the religious orders, and which distinguishes them from other associations, is abandonment of purely secular pursuits, celibacy, and their organization by means of religious vows into communities of an entirely ecclesiastical character.

They are divided into two classes—the contemplative and the active. The contemplative orders, few in number in modern times, spend their whole lives in praying and fasting, in vigils and meditations, and continued efforts to attain to the highest Christian perfection. The active orders, which are far more numerous with a larger membership, are engaged in teaching and preaching, in nursing the sick, in taking care of the poor and infirm, or in spreading the Gospel in heathen lands. Yet they devote a considerable portion of the time to retirement, recollection, meditation, prayer and ascetic discipline, without which they would soon lose their robust virtue, neglect or slight their active duties, and be distinguishable only by the habit they wear from people of the world. They are strengthened for their corporal works of mercy only by prayer and meditation. Let these duties be neglected, and discipline will be relaxed, the spirit of a religious order will depart, its usefulness cease, the manners of its members become dissolute, and grave scandals ensue. St. Augustine's words are both pointed and truthful.—"I have not," says he, "found anywhere better men then good monks and neither have I "found worse than bad monks."

Protestant Tributes

Although the real worth and services rendered to religion and civilization by the monastic orders have not always been fairly or fully appre-

ciated, they have elicited eloquent tributes of admiration from many distinguished Protestant historians and essayists.

"I confess," says Von Leibnitz,* "that I have ardently admired the "religious orders, and the pious associations, and the other similar admir- "able institutions; for they are a sort of celestial soldiery upon earth, "provided they are governed according to the institutes of their founders, "and regulated by the Supreme Pontiff for the use of the Universal "Church. For what can be more glorious than to carry the light of "truth to distant nations, through seas and fires, and swords—to traffic "in the salvation of souls alone—to forego the allurements of pleasure, "and even the enjoyment of conversation and of social intercourse, in "order to pursue, undisturbed, the contemplation of abstruse truths and "divine meditation—to dedicate oneself to the education of youth in "science and in virtue—to assist and console the wretched, the despair- "ing, the lost, the captive, the condemned, the sick,—in squalor, in chains, "in distant lands—undeterred even by the fear of pestilence from the "lavish exercise of these heavenly offices of charity. The man who knows "not, or despises these things, has but a vulgar and plebeian conception of "virtue; he foolishly measures the obligations of men toward their God "by the perfunctory discharge of ordinary duties, and by that frozen habit "of life, devoid of zeal, which prevails commonly among men."

Maitland in his "Dark Ages," tells us that—"It is quite impossible "to touch the subject of *Monasticism* without rubbing off some of the "dirt which has been heaped upon it. It is impossible to get even a "superficial knowledge of the mediaeval history of Europe without "seeing how greatly the world of that period was indebted to the "monastic orders; as a quiet and religious refuge for helpless infancy "and old age, a shelter of respectful sympathy for the orphan maiden and "the desolate widow—as central points whence agriculture was spread "over bleak hills, and barren downs, and marshy plains, and dealt its "bread to millions perishing with hunger and its pestilential train—as "repositories of the learning which then was, and the well springs for the

*Systema Theologicum.

" learning which was yet to be—as nurseries of art and science, giving " the stimulus, the means, and the reward to invention, and aggregating " around them every head that could devise, and every hand that could " execute—as the nucleus of the city which in after days of pride should " crown its palaces and bulwarks with the towering cross of its cathedral. " This, I think, no man can deny. I believe it is true, and I love to " think of it. I hope that I see the good hand of God in it, and the " visible trace of His mercy that is over all His works. But if it is only a " dream, however grateful, I shall be glad to be awakened from it; not " indeed by the yelling of illiterate agitators, but by a quiet and sober " proof that I have misunderstood the matter."

About the Jesuits Specially

And now, as an introductory to the particular religious order which is to engage our attention this evening, I should like to quote some words showing Sir James Macintosh's appreciation of the Jesuits. They are to be found in his "Review of the Causes of the Revolution," (1688) and are as follows:—

" Having arisen in the age of the Reformation, they naturally be- " came the champions of the Church against her enemies. They cultivated " polite literature with splendid success; they were the earliest and perhaps " the most extensive reformers of European education, which in their " schools made a larger stride than it has done at any succeeding moment; " and by the just reputation of their learning, as well as by the weapons " with which it armed them, they were enabled to carry on a vigorous " contest against the most learned impugners of the authority of the " Church * * * In India they suffered martyrdom with heroic constancy. " They penetrated through the barriers which Chinese policy opposed to " the entrance of strangers, cultivating the most difficult of languages with " such success as to compose hundreds of volumes in it; and, by the public " utility of their scientific acquirements, obtained toleration, patronage and " personal honors from that jealous government. The natives of America, who " generally felt the comparative superiority of the European race only in " a more rapid or a more gradual destruction, and to whom even the

" Quakers dealt out little more than penurious justice, were, under the " fraternal rule of the Jesuits, reclaimed from savage manners, and " instructed in the arts and duties of civilized life. * * * No other associa- " tion ever sent forth so many disciples who reached such eminence in " departments so various and unlike. * * * The most famous constitution- " alists, the most skilful casuits, the ablest school masters, the most cele- " brated professors, the best teachers of the humblest mechanical arts, " the missionaries who could most bravely encounter martyrdom, or who " with the most patient skill could infuse the rudiments of religion into " the minds of ignorant tribes or prejudiced nations, were the growth of " their fertile schools."

Their Institution

Catholic Church historians agree that the religious orders, whose members were more numerous than the secular clergy, showed themselves utterly unequal to the task of grappling with the dangers that menaced the church in the sixteenth century. A committee appointed by Pope Paul III, in 1537, to examine and report upon the condition of the monks, gave it as their opinion, that the communities of those religious houses, in which discipline had become relaxed and manners dissolute, should be allowed to die out, when others more zealous and honest might take their place. There arose at once, providentially, a new order, which apparently growing out of the circumstances of the age, was for this very reason peculiarly fitted to minister to its needs. Specially designed to repel the advances of Protestantism, this order has at all times filled the Protestant mind with vague and undefined terrors. From their origin the Jesuits have had numerous enemies; never have they been free from them, either in their prosperity and greatness, or in their fall, or even after it. Since their re-appearance they have been the constant object of bitter animosity, odious calumny, and virulent abuse.* This is the best demonstration that can be given of the eminent merit of the Jesuits. It must be the same with classes and corporations as with individuals,—very extraordinary merit necessarily excites numerous enemies, for the simple reason that such merit is always envied, and very often dreaded.

*See Balmes' " European Civilization."

The Fourth Vow and its Significance

To the three ordinary religious vows of poverty, obedience, and chastity—which are a protest against the three prominent and most dangerous vices of every age and country—the Jesuits added a fourth, that of strict obedience to the orders of the Holy Father. In the early ages of the Church, and especially in what are called the middle ages, there was no call for a vow of special obedience to the Pope. There was always, it is true, in those days enough of disobedience to the Holy Father on the part of professedly Christian sovereigns, princes, nobles, and even bishops, but there was at the same time the recognition in principle of the Papal Supremacy. The Reformation, on the other hand, was the attempt of the disobedient to erect their disobedience into a principle. As Brownson* clearly puts it, the Reformers had no intention of warring against the Church; educated under feudalism in the State, they imagined they could throw off the suzerainty of the Pope without injury, nay with positive benefit to the Church, as a feudatory of the monarch might in some cases throw off the suzerainty of the Emperor or King, with positive advantages to their estates. The event has proved, what should have been foreseen and understood, that in casting off the Papacy, the Reformers cast off the Church herself, because the Pope is not merely suzerain, but under God the Sovereign of the Church. Our Lord built the Church on Peter, and Peter, the Rock, removed, it had no foundation. There was a divine inspiration, then, in the thought of St Ignatius, and a special propriety in enjoining on the members of the Company he organized this fourth vow, or vow of special obedience to the Pope. It was a solemn protest against the very principle of the Reformation, and made the Society of Jesus a standing assertion of the Papacy, and a living monument of devotion to the Holy See. The Council of Trent condemned the particular or special heresies of the Reformation, but it did not explicitly condemn its principle, for its principle was not then fully disengaged, and rendered apparent to the whole world. It is only latterly that even Protestants themselves have understood it, and were able to formulate

*"Religious Orders."

it. Nobody saw from the first, that Protestantism was wholly concentrated in the rejection of the Papal constitution of the Church; hardly did anybody see it before the present century. Protestants have shown themselves willing to fraternize with the eastern churches separated from Rome, and which differ from the Catholic Church in no important points but in rejecting the Supremacy or Primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope, without asking any change of doctrine or worship on the part of those churches. We have seen and we see now multitudes of Protestants, like the Puseyites and Ritualists, who accept and defend all Catholic doctrine, except the Papal Supremacy and Infallibility, and nearly the whole Protestant world would cease to oppose the Church, if she would only give up the Pope. They would accept willingly the play of Hamlet with the part of the Prince of Denmark left out. The fourth vow of the Jesuits pledged them to a direct and necessary warfare on the essential principle of the Reformation, and for the essential principle of the Constitution of the Church.

St. Ignatius and his Companions

On the dawn of the day, in the year 1534, on which the Church celebrated the Assumption of our Blessed Lady, the 15th August, a little band of men, clad with the clerical habit, ascended the hill called Montmartre, in Paris, and entered the crypt of the chapel of St. Denys, which then marked the spot where the Apostle of France had won the crown of martyrdom. Their leader was Ignatius of Loyola, who, descended from a noble Spanish family, had in his youth beeen a courtier and a soldier, and was wounded at the siege of Pampeluna in 1521, where he distinguished himself by his gallantry. Beside him, in the sanctuary, knelt Francis Xavier, by birth a grandee of Spain, James Laynez, Alphonsus Salmeron and Nicholas Bobadilla, also Spaniards, and Alphonsus Rodriguez, a Portuguese. At the altar ministered Peter Faber or Lefevre, once a shepherd in the mountains of Savoy, but now a priest in holy orders. By his hands—for he was the only priest as yet among them—the bread of life was distributed to his associates, and then were lifted up their united voices, uttering their vow, to renounce the world, and to labor for the conversion of souls in the Holy Land; or, if unable to execute this project, to offer themselves to

the Pope, to be disposed of by him for the greater glory of God. Subsequently Ignatius found it necessary to visit his native county; so, having given his disciples a rule of life and special instructions regarding their practices of devotion, he left them in Paris under the care of Peter Faber, and directed that they should meet him in Venice, on the 25th January, 1537, nearly two years later. Meanwhile their mission to the Holy Land was rendered impossible by war, and so, on his return, Ignatius despatched them to preach in different towns of Italy. Before dispersing, he bade them, when they were questioned as to what congregation they belonged, to reply that they were of "The Society of Jesus." In 1539 Ignatius, accompanied by Faber and Laynez, repaired to Rome, and submitted the Rule of the proposed new order to Pope Paul III. Three Cardinals were appointed to report upon it; and, although at first they were opposed, their opinions changed suddenly and remarkably, and he approved "The Society of Jesus" in a Bull, which bears that title, dated 27th September, 1540. Ignatius entered upon his duties as General on Easter Sunday, 1541. The number of "professed" members to be admitted was at first limited to sixty; but, learning the beneficial results of their early labors, Paul III. removed the restriction, March 14, 1543, and his successors granted them many important privileges.

Constitutions and Government

Ignatius of Loyola was a great legislator, and we find a proof of this fact in his Constitutions or Rules for the Society. The sanctification of the souls of his spiritual children, by the union of a contemplative and active life, is in the first instance laid down as absolutely necessary; then comes laboring for the salvation and perfection of our neighbor, by catechising the ignorant, instructing youth in piety and learning, upon which the reformation of the world really depends. The direction of consciences, missions, and the general work of an evangelist form the third great division of labor. No other habit than that generally used by the clergy was to be worn. Before anyone was to be admitted to the Order he was to employ an entire month in spiritual exercises and making a general confession. Then comes two years of novitiate, followed by simple

vows of poverty, chastity and obedience—the Order reserving to itself the right of dismissing the subject at any time. Subsequently, usually after all studies had been completed, second or solemn vows were made, binding both sides, so that a professed Jesuit cannot be discharged by the Order from the obligations incurred by him to it. On this occasion the fourth vow is pronounced, of undertaking any mission enjoined by the Pope. A class of Jesuits who do not take this vow are styled spiritual co-adjutors and temporal co-adjutors. Several conditions are requisite for those who aspire to enter the Society; one is that they should not have belonged, even for a day, to any other religious order. The Rule also excludes apostates, public sinners, great criminals, and men of weak intellect or subject to insanity. "Weak intellect or subject to insanity"—Alas! I fear some journalists and preachers that we wot of are hopelessly excluded.

The General is the head of the Society; but while investing him with clearly defined and supreme authority, Ignatius multiplies precautions to prevent this power from degenerating into despotism. The Society is divided into provinces, each comprising a certain number of houses, and governed by a Provincial, who is assisted by Consultors and by an Admonitor, named by the General; and each house is governed by a Superior or Rector, who also has his Consultors and an Admonitor. On the election of a new General, the professed Fathers and the Rectors in each province assemble, and select two of their number, who accompany the Provincial to the general congregation, by which the head of the Society is chosen. Several Assistants, belonging to different nationalities, and, like himself appointed by election, are assigned to the Father General; and these he consults on matters regarding the administration of the Order. An Admonitor is likewise elected; and his duty is to be a prudent counsellor, ever at hand, to advise on all that concerns the General's private conduct. In an extreme case, which has never occurred, the provinces of the Society might elect deputies to depose the head of the Order. The "*Monita Secreta*," or "Secret Instructions" which, it is said, were meant to be reserved solely for the professed Fathers, and with whose odious and monstrous principles the Society has been so persistently and so unjustly ccused, are calumnious and apochryphal productions, published against

the Jesuits by their enemies. Another calumny is the interpretation which some have put upon a certain passage in the Constitutions, which, it is claimed, gives a Superior the power to oblige the members to do evil under certain circumstances. No one acquainted with the Latin language can attach such a meaning to the passage in question without intentionally misapprehending its true sense. Obedience is required and promised in all things, where there is no sin, and this condition is repeated over and over again.

First Missions

Ignatius frequently and strenuously endeavored to resign the dignity of General, until the Pope forbade him to do so. As soon as he was appointed he went into the kitchen and served in a menial office under the orders of the cook. He continued to teach the catechism to poor children, while he preached with such wonderful unction and fervor as to bring back the time of the first Apostles, when multitudes were converted by hearing the word of God. Novices multiplied, and Ignatius himself watched over them, strengthening their virtue, and subjecting them to serve tests, so as to train up worthy warriors for the truth. Portugal, Spain, Italy, Germany and the Low Countries began to ask for the assistance of the members of the Society. Francis Xavier was despatched to India, there to gain nations to Christ. John Nunez and Louis Gonzalez were sent to the North of Africa, to comfort, teach, and assist Christian slaves among the Moors. Four other missionaries were sent to Congo on the torrid coast of Western Africa. In 1555 Abyssinia was supplied with thirteen Jesuit missionaries, one of whom was appointed by Pope Julius III. to be Patriarch of Ethiopia. About the same time, South America received the first of that devoted band who succeeded in converting nations, and in bringing tens of thousands of souls to the knowledge of the truth. As a mark of favor and appreciation, the Vicar of Christ appointed Fathers James Laynez, Alphonsus Salmeron, and Claude Le Jay, to assist, as his theologians, at the Council of Trent, where the three fathers proved that, by their erudition, eloquence and prudence, they were fully equal to their important mission. Ireland was one of the first countries to which Jesuits were sent. That island, in which the greatest danger and the greatest

affliction existed, was specially the land for the sons of St. Ignatius. Robert, Archbishop of Armagh, felt compelled to lay before the Holy Father, an account of the cruel and inhuman persecutions suffered by Catholics under the rule of Henry VIII. His Holiness, deeply affected, requested that Fathers of the Society should be sent, and Ignatius lost no time in despatching them. These zealous men, Salmeron and Brouet, set out in 1542, and traversed the whole island. Wherever they passed hearts were strengthened, consciences set at rest, doubts solved, fears dispelled, and fainting spirits fortified to bear the Cross. But their presence was made a pretext for fresh persecution, and they were consequently compelled to retire. It was not until 1580 that the Jesuits "invaded" England.

Two Pictures

" Before the Order had existed a hundred years," says Macaulay in " his "History of England," " it had filled the whole world with memorials " of the great things done and suffered for the faith. No religious com- " munity could produce a list of men so variously distinguished; none " had extended its operations over so vast a space; yet in none had " there been such perfect unity of feeling and action. There was no " region of the globe, no walk of speculative or active life, in which " Jesuits were not to be found. They guided the Councils of " Kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed the motions " of Jupiter's satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, " casuistry, history, treatises on optics, alcaic odes, editions of the fathers, " madrigals, catechisms and lampoons. The liberal education of youth " passed almost entirely into their hands, and was conducted by them with " conspicuous ability. They appear to have discovered the precise point to " which intellectual culture can be carried without the risk of intellectual " emancipation. Enmity itself was compelled to own that, in the art of " managing and forming the tender mind, they had no equals. Mean- " while they assiduously and successfully cultivated the eloquence of the " pulpit. With still greater assiduity and still greater success they applied " themselves to the ministry of the confessional. * * * They wander-

ed to countries which neither mercantile avidity nor liberal curiosity "had ever impelled any stranger to explore. They were to be found in the "garb of mandarins, superintending the observatory at Pekin. They were "to be found, spade in hand, teaching the rudiments of agriculture to the "savages of Paraguay. Yet, whatever might be their residence, what "ever might be their employment, their spirit was the same, entire devo- "tion to the common cause, unreasoning obedience to the central authority. "None of them had chosen his dwelling place or his vocation for him- "self. Whether the Jesuit should live under the arctic circle or under "the equator, whether he should pass his life in arranging gems and col- "lating manuscripts at the Vatican, or in persuading naked barbarians "under the Southern Cross not to eat each other, were matters which he "left with profound submission to the decision of others. If he was "wanted at Lima, he was on the Atlantic in the next fleet. If he was wanted "at Bagdad, he was toiling through the desert with the next caravan. "If his ministry was needed in some country where his life was more in- "secure than that of a wolf, where it was a crime to harbor him, where "the heads and quarters of his brethren, fixed in the public places, showed "him what he had to expect, he went without remonstrance or hesita- "tion to his doom. Nor is this heroic spirit yet extinct."

A critical reader will, perhaps, find this picture too highly colored, and some of its subjects over-drawn, for one of Macaulay's faults, as an historian, is exaggeration.* With still greater reason, objection may be taken to the following from the same pen :—

"With the admirable energy, disinterestedness, and self devotion which "were characteristic of the Society, great vices were mingled. It was "alleged, and not without foundation, that the ardent public spirit which "made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty, and of his life, made "him also regardless of truth and of mercy; that no means which could "promote the interest of his religion seemed to him unlawful, and that by "the interest of his religion he too often meant the interest of his

* Very much to the point, in this *bon-mot* in "Editor's Drawer" of *Harper's Magazine* for March :— "A critic who was asked if imagination were essential to literary success said to have replied : In history and biography, yes. In fiction we can dispense with

"Society. It was alleged that, in the most atrocious plots recorded "in history, his agency could be distinctly traced; that constant "only in attachment to the fraternity to which he belonged, he was in some "countries the most dangerous enemy of freedom, and in others the most "dangerous enemy of order. * * * So strangely were good and evil mixed "in the character of these celebrated brethren; and the intermixture was "the secret of their gigantic power. That power could never have belonged "ed to mere hypocrites. It was to be attained only by men sincerly en- "thusiastic in the pursuit of a great end, and at the same time unscrupulous "as to the choice of means."

In short, according to Macaulay, the Society of Jesus is a sort of "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" combination. So it is—in fiction!

"Worthy of hearty admiration and respect."

The Reviewer in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica** of the Jesuits—their Organization, History and Teaching, is the well-known Dr. Littledale. Let us hear what he has to say:—

"So constituted, with a skilful combination of strictness and laxity, "of complex organization with the minimum of friction in working, the "Society was admirably devised for its purpose of introducing a new power "into the Church and the world, and for carrying out effectively every part "of its vast programme. Thus equipped, its services to Roman Catholic- "ism have been incalculable. The Jesuits alone rolled back the tide of "Protestant advance, when that half of Europe which had not already "shaken off its allegiance to the Papacy was threatening to do so, and the "whole honours of the counter-Reformation are theirs singly. They had "the sagacity to see, and to admit in their correspondence with their "superiors, that the Reformation, as a popular movement, was fully justi- "fied by the gross ignorance, negligence and open vice of the Catholic "clergy, whether secular or monastic; and they were shrewd enough to "discern the only possible remedies. At a time when primary and even "secondary education had in most places become a mere effete and "pedantic adherence to obsolete methods, they were bold enough to innovate

*9th edition, 1881, vol. xiii.

" less in system than in materials, and, putting fresh spirit and devotion into " the work, not merely taught and catechized in a new, fresh and attractive " manner, besides establishing free schools of good quality, but provided new " manuals and school books for their pupils, which were an enormous ad- " vance on those they found in use, so that for nearly three centuries the " Jesuits were accounted the best schoolmasters in Europe, as they were, " till their forcible suppression the other day, confessedly the best in " France,—besides having always conciliated the good will of their pupils " by mingled firmness and gentleness as teachers. And, although their " own methods have in time given way to further improvements, yet they " revolutionized instruction as completely as Frederick the Great did " modern warfare, and have thus acted, whether they meant it or not, as " pioneers of human progress. Again, when the regular clergy had sunk " into the moral and intellectual slough which is pictured for us in the " writings of Erasmus and in the powerful satire, *Epistolæ Obscurorum* " *Virorum*, while there was little of a better kind visible in the lives of the " parochial priesthood, the Jesuits won back respect for the clerical calling " by their personal culture and the unimpeachable purity of their lives. " These are qualities which they have all along carefully maintained, and " probably no body of men in the world has been so free from the reproach " of discreditable members, or has kept up an equally high average level of " intelligence and conduct. As preachers, too, they delivered the pulpit " from the bondage of an effete scholasticism, and reached at once a clear- " ness and simplicity of treatment such as the English pulpit scarcely " begins to exhibit till after the days of Tillotson ; while in literature and " theology they count a far larger number of respectable writers than any " other religious society can boast. It is in the mission field, however, that " their achievements have been most remarkable, which might fully justify " their taking as their motto: —

" Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris ? "

" Whether toiling amongst the teeming millions of Hindustan and " China, labouring amongst the Hurons and Iroquois of North America, " governing and civilizing the natives of Brazil and Paraguay, in the " missions and 'reductions,' or ministering, at the hourly risk of his life, to

" his co-religionists in England under Elizabeth and James I., the Jesuit " appears alike devoted, indefatigable, cheerful, and worthy of hearty " admiration and respect."

Accused of Conspiracies and Assassinations

" Nevertheless, two most startling and indisputable facts meet the " student who pursues the history of this unique Society. The first is the " universal suspicion and hostility it has incurred,—not, as might reason- " ably be expected, merely from those Protestants whose avowed and most " successful foe it has been, nor yet from the enemies of all clericalism and " religious dogma, to whom it is naturally the embodiment of all they most " detest, but from every Roman Catholic state and nation in the world, " with perhaps the insignificant exception of Belgium. Next is the " brand of ultimate failure which has invariably been stamped on all " its most promising schemes and efforts. * * * These two phenomena " demand some inquiry and analysis. As regards the former of them; " the hostility which the Jesuits have encountered has been twofold, poli- " tical, and moral or religious. There has been from a very early date in " their annals, a strong conviction prevalent that the famous motto of the " Society, 'A. M. D. G.,' (*Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam—To the Greater Glory* " *of God*), did not adequately represent its policy and motives, that its " first and last aim was its own aggrandizement in power and wealth, and " that it spared no effort to compass this end, even to the extent of " embroiling cabinets, concocting conspiracies, kindling wars, and procur- " ing assassinations. In several of these cases, notably as regards the charges " which led to their first expulsion from France and Portugal, inclusive " in the latter instance of their exile from Paraguay, the Jesuits are able " to make one very telling reply, pleading that motives of state-craft alone, " of an unworthy kind, and the evidence of untrustworthy and disrepu- " table agents of their enemies, were suffered to decide the matter. In " other cases, as for example the assassination of Henry IV. by Ravaillac, " they deny all complicity, and no sufficient proof has ever been adduced " against them. But, when full allowance has been made for such rejoin- " ders, there remain several counts of the indictment which are but too

"clearly made out: as, for instance, their large share, as preachers, in "fanning the flames of polemical hatred against the Huguenots, * * * "their complicity in the plots against the life of Queen Elizabeth, " * * * their responsibility for the Thirty Years' War. And "in regard to a large number of other cases where the evidence against "them is defective, it is at least an unfortunate coincidence that there is "always direct proof of some Jesuit having been in communication with "the actual agents engaged. So it was with the massacre of St. Bartholomew, almost immediately preceded by a visit of the Jesuit General, "Francis Borgia, to the French Court, though there is no other evidence "to connect him therewith; so with Châtel and Ravaillac, the unsuccessful and successful assassins of Henry IV.; so with Jaureguay and "Balthasar Gerard, who held the like relation to William the Silent, "Prince of Orange; so with the accomplices in the Gunpowder Plot. "In all these and several other instances, the precautions which would "naturally, and even inevitably be taken by skilled and wary diplomatists "for their own protection are sufficient to account for the lack of direct "proof against them, but it is not easy to explain the invariable presence of "a Jesuit in the back-ground on any hypothesis which will secure the complete acquittal of the Society from charges of the sort. It is sufficient to "say here in illustration that the English Roman Catholics under Elizabeth, addressing the Pope with regard to the severe penal laws which "oppressed them, laid the whole blame of the Government's action on the "Jesuits, as having provoked it by their conspiracies; while the secular "priests in England issued in 1601 by the pen of one of their number, "William Watson (afterwards executed in 1603), a pamphlet known as "*Important Considerations*, to the same effect."

What are the charges against the Jesuits?

"*Concocting conspiracies, kindling wars, and procuring assassinations.*"

And the proofs?

There are no "sufficient" proofs; "*but it is not easy to explain the invariable presence of a Jesuit in the back-ground, on any hypothesis which will secure the complete acquittal of the Society from charges of the sort.* It is

SUFFICIENT TO SAY HERE, IN ILLUSTRATION, that the English Roman Catholics under Elizabeth, addressing the Pope with regard to the severe penal laws which oppressed them, laid the whole blame of the Government's action on the Jesuits, as having provoked it by their conspiracies; while the secular priests in England issued, in 1601, by the pen of one of their number, William Watson, a pamphlet, known as *Important Considertions*, to the same effect."

The investigation is, therefore, limited to English history.

No Jesuits to provoke Elizabeth's penal laws

I have not at hand the address of "The Roman Catholics of England" referred to. Very likely its originators and signers had as much right to speak for *The* Roman Catholics of England, as the famous tailors or Tooley St. had, on another occasion, to call themselves "*The* People of England." But how very childish; not to say ridiculous, their conduct appears in the light that history has shed upon the events of that blood-stained era. They blamed the Jesuits for having provoked the penal laws by their conspiracies! Why, the Jesuits did not come into the country until 1580. This was the 22nd year of Elizabeth's reign, and she had already acquired a reputation as a Coercionist that would put even Mr. Balfour to shame. She ascended the throne with a policy in her own mind clearly marked—to crush out the old Faith; and forthwith she began to carry it into effect. What do we read? "The funeral of Mary (her predecessor) "was celebrated according to the Catholic Ritual. White, the Bishop of "Winchester, who preached on the occasion, uttered something which "gave offence to Elizabeth. There seems, however, to have been nothing "in the sermon disrespectful towards her; and if the law, on such an "occasion, were at all applicable, there was nothing against the law. No "matter; it had offended Elizabeth, and, therefore, both the personal "liberty of the subject and the episcopal character must be despised; the "Bishop was ordered to remain shut up in his own house; and, after a "month's confinement, was summoned before the Council, to receive a "stern reprimand."*

* Flanagan's "History of the Church in England."—Vol. II.

In the following year, 1559, there was a statute passed, called a "Bill of Supremacy," which enacted that those who by writing or preaching defended "the power or jurisdiction, spiritual or ecclesiastical," of what is termed "any foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate," were doomed to forfeiture of all their property and benefices, if they had any; and if not worth twenty pounds were to suffer a year's imprisonment. For a second offence all such persons were to suffer the penalties of a praemunire; and a third offence was declared to be high treason.

Next there was a "Bill of Uniformity," which enacted that "The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonials," authorized in the fifth and sixth of Edward VI., was to be "in full force and effect, with very few alterations," and to be everywhere used. Ministers refusing to use it were, for the first offence, to forfeit one year's income, and to be imprisoned for six months; for a second, were to be deprived, and to be imprisoned for twelve months; and for a third, were doomed to perpetual imprisonment, as well as a new deprivation. To use any words in derogation of the same book, was made liable, for a first offence, to the penalty of a hundred marks; for a second, to one of four hundred; and for a third, to forfeiture and perpetual imprisonment. As if these violent measures were not enough; people were to be forced to attend the services thus schismatically changed, by spiritual censures, and by a fine of one shilling for every case of absence on Sundays and holy-days. On Whitsunday, May 8, began the new service in English, and the removal of the images of the saints. This was followed by the public burning, in many parts of London, of "all the roods and other images of the churches." After the image of Christ and the reminiscenses of Calvary were thus given to the flames, it is but a trifle that "vestments, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchres and rood-lofts were burned." The exaction of the Oath of Supremacy was meantime proceeding in all parts of the country. Its effect upon the universities was briefly but effectively told by Jewell, the Protestant Bishop: "There is a dismal solitude in our universities; the young men are flying about in all directions, rather than come to an agreement in matters of religion."*

* Ibid.

In 1563, there was another Act, which required all members of parliament, all persons taking degrees in the universities, all sheriffs, barristers, attorneys, school-masters, private tutors, and officers in any court whatever, and every other person at the Lord Chancellor's discretion, to take the Oath of Supremacy, under the penalty of a præmunire for every offender, and of one hundred pounds for every conniving or negligent Justice. A second offence was to be punished with "the same pains, forfeiture, judgment and execution, as is used in cases of high treason."

In April, 1571, it was by Act of Parliament made high treason, even for a first offence, to declare in any work that the Queen was a heretic or schismatic, no less than to declare her a tyrant and usurper. It was made treason to "bring from the City of Rome to England," or to use any writing or instrument from the Pope, whatever "might be its contents." It was no less treason to give or receive absolution, in virtue of any written jurisdiction from the Holy See, although it was the general practice of the Church to give such power only in writing. Even the mere fact of possessing an Agnus Dei, or beads, or crosses, or pictures blessed by the Pope, or by the missionaries sent by him, was now subjected to the heavy punishment of a praemunire. Those Catholics who had fled their country were not altogether out of the reach of these tyrannical enactments; unless they returned within six months after proclamation to that effect, even if they had procured a formal leave of absence, they forfeited to the Crown for life, their goods and chattels, and their landed revenues.

Needless to say, that these and other penal laws, which were placed in the Statute-book long before the Jesuit "invasion" of the country, were rigorously enforced, the punishment for high-treason being death.

Pioneer Jesuits in England

As I have already said, it was in 1580 that the Jesuits first entered England as missioners. Ignatius had long since gone to his reward, and Father Everard Mercurian, the fourth General of the Society, was in command. The Fathers selected for this arduous and dangerous mis-

ion were Robert Persons and Edmund Campion, both Englishmen and graduates of Oxford University. Green relates in his "History of the English People," that, "For the moment their success was amazing. The "eagerness shown to hear Campion was so great, that, in spite of the denunciations of the Government, he was able to preach with hardly a "show of concealment to a vast audience in Smithfield. From London "the missionaries wandered in the disguise of captains or serving men, or "sometimes in the cassock of the English clergy, through many of the "counties; and wherever they went the zeal of the Catholic gentry revived. The list of nobles reconciled to the old Faith by the wandering "apostles, was headed by the name of Lord Oxford, Burleigh's own son-"in-law, and the proudest among English peers. The success of the "Jesuits in undoing Elizabeth's work of compromise was shown in a more "public way by the unanimity with which the Catholics withdrew from "attendance at the national worship. As in the case of the Seminary "Priests, however, *the panic of the Protestants and of the Parliament far* "*outran the greatness of the danger.* The little group of missionaries was "magnified by popular fancy into a host of disguised Jesuits; and the imaginary invasion was met by statutes which prohibited the saying of Mass "even in private houses, increased the fine on recusants to twenty pounds "a month, and enacted that, 'all persons pretending to any power of absolving subjects from their allegiance, or practising to withdraw them "to the Romish religion, with all persons after the present session willingly so absolved or reconciled to the See of Rome, shall be guilty of "high treason.'"

Everywhere arrests and confiscations followed. Campion, after many narrow escapes, was captured in July, 1581, or less than thirteen months after his arrival, and lodged in the Tower, where he was mercilessly tortured during four months. He was then put on trial at the Queen's Bench, in company with fourteen others, of whom twelve were priests, charged with high treason. Their trial was a mockery of justice. At the foot of the gibbet, Campion, addressing the people, said: "I am a Catholic and a priest: in that faith have I lived, and in that faith I intend to die;

and if you esteem my religion treason, then am I guilty. As for any other treason, I never committed, God is my judge."

Disobedience Not Treason.

Dr. Littledale, who cites, as evidence against the Jesuits, an alleged address of "The English Roman Catholics" to the Pope, blaming the Jesuits for having provoked, by their conspiracies, the penal enactments of Elizabeth's reign—a senseless charge as I have shown—quietly ignores the elaborate "Apology or Defence of the Jesuits and Seminarists," published by Dr., afterwards, Cardinal Allen, some months subsequent to Campion's execution. William Allen was born of a respectable family in Lancashire. Educated at Oriel College, Oxford, he became Proctor of the University in 1556, and was made Canon of the Cathedral of York. After refuting several odious and groundless accusations, the Apology continues :—"Another, and the most odious of all, is brought, not only "against us, but even against the Supreme Pontiff; the Priests and "Jesuits have, it is said, been sent to England to treat, not only of "Religion and the Conscience, but to draw the minds of men from the "obedience due to the Sovereign, and to plot against the State. That this "charge is utterly groundless, the writer of this Apology can prove, by "producing, if necessary, authentic documents, which he has in his posses-"sion. We protest, therefore, that neither the Reverend Fathers of the "Society of the Most Holy Name of Jesus (usually termed Jesuits), nor "the Priests or Students of the Seminaries, have any instructions or insinu-"ations from the Pope, or other Superiors, to do or move any matter "against the existing temporal rule, or have any other directions, but to "preach, catechize, administer the sacraments, and perform such other "offices as are necessary for the souls of the faithful. The Jesuits, more-"over, have a clause inserted in their instructions, expressly forbidding "them 'to interfere in the business of the republic.' This being the case, "where is there any ground for the charge of treason? Or is the adminis-"tration of the sacraments treason? As it would be ridiculous and "impossible to make by Act of Parliament the recitation of the Divine "Office, according to the rite of the Catholic Church, to be simony, usury,

"theft, or adultery, so indeed, is it impossible to make those things which "merely concern Religion become the crimes of treason, or of contumacy "against the Sovereign and State."*

"A Jesuit in the Back-ground"

As for William Watson and his pamphlet "Important Considerations," also cited in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as a witness against the Jesuits, the value of his testimony will appear from the follow relation of facts, and his own confession on the scaffold :—

In 1603 some disappointed courtiers and Puritans—Grey, Raleigh, Cobham, and others—had formed a plot to seize James I. To strengthen their party by the accession of the Catholics, they made overtures to Watson. The latter seems to have thought that if by a counter-plot, he could then rescue the King, the royal gratitude would thenceforth befriend the Catholics. He drew into his schemes another priest of the name of Clarke. Whilst he was contriving his notable scheme, it was discovered by several parties, and amongst the rest by Father Gerard and some other Jesuits. The latter informed Garnet, their Superior, as well as Blackwell, the Arch-priest, *who commanded them, as it was evident treason, to inform the Government.* Accordingly, Gage, a Catholic gentleman, and Francis Barnaby, a secular priest, informed Bancroft, of London, whilst Father Gerard sent word to James by a Scotch Catholic, one of the King's servants, who, finding that it had become known the day before, made no communication. Being well versed in the arts of his father and of Walsingham, Cecil allowed the conspiracy to ripen ; but finding it abandoned, seized its promoters. One of these declared on his trial, that it was suggested by James himself, as a means of testing the loyalty of the young nobles. The chief agents were imprisoned ; but George Brookes and the two priests, Watson and Clarke, suffered the death of traitors. Watson, when arrived at the scaffold, was so much more concerned for his sin than for the cruel death before him, that he expressed his wish that he had a life to forfeit for every one "whom he had by his treachery drawn into this treason."‡

*Flanagan's "History of the Church in England," vol. ii.
‡Ibid.

Penal laws not their own apology

But what of those other penal laws, too numerous to mention, enacted under Elizabeth's successors? Why not blame the Jesuits for the whole series? Dr. Littledale knows full well, that the mere fact of a Coercion Bill being placed among the Statutes is not in itself sufficient proof of its necessity. This has been brought home time and again of late, with telling effect, to the minds of the English people, but never, perhaps, more clearly, more pointedly, and more authoritatively, than it was in open Court, during the trial of Lord George Gordon, on Feb. 5, 1781. The then Attorney-General, who was Prosecutor in the case, said in his opening speech :—

"In the latter end of the year 1778, an Act of Parliament passed to "repeal certain provisions affecting the Roman Catholics in this country, "contained in an Act of Parliament made in the eleventh and twelfth years "of the reign of King William III^r. The particular provisions which it "was the object of this Act to repeal were these: By the Statute of King "William, every Popish priest, exercising any part of his function in this "Kingdom, was liable to perpetual imprisonment; every person of the "Popish religion, keeping a school or taking upon himself the educa- "tion, government or boarding of youth, was liable to the same "punishment. And by another part of this Act, Roman Catholics "were rendered incapable of inheriting or taking by devise or "limitation any estates from their parents or others, unless they should "take oaths and subscribe a declaration, which by their religion they "could not conscientiously do, and their estates were to go immediately "over to their next of kin being Protestants, and them and their families "left to starve. There was another provision too which made them "incapable of taking an estate by purchase.

"This Act, containing such severe penalties, could only be justified by "the necessity of the case, for the salvation of the State and our religion. "It is the height of severity to punish men for serving God in their own "way, or in employing themselves in one of the most important duties to "society, the education of youth; that men shall for these reasons alone

"be doomed to a loathsome prison for their lives, and to the perpetual "society of the most profligate and wretched of mankind, is cruel and "horrid. The other part of this Act was extremely severe in depriving a "man of his birthright and inheritance.

"The history of the times, indeed, *does not furnish* ANY PROOF *of the* "*necessity, nor afford* AN APOLOGY *for the hardship of these provisions.* An "account of the commencement and progress of the Act is given by a "very learned divine, who was at that time a member of the House of "Peers, Bishop Burnet. It originated in party faction, in opposition to the "Court at that time. The Bill was brought into the House of Commons "that the Court party might reject it, and draw upon themselves the odium "of a measure in favour of the Catholics, for those that brought in the "Bill did not mean it should pass; they were disappointed in their view, "for the Court party made no opposition to it. They then wished to drop "it, but they could not, upon which Bishop Burnet says, they added very "severe and unreasonable clauses to the Bill and sent it up to the House of "Lords, in hopes that that House would reject it; in this they were dis-"appointed too, for the House of Lords did not reject the Bill, but suffered "it to pass with the severe penalties and punishments I have stated. It is "too much, in my opinion, (adds the Attorney-General) for any party or "faction to stake upon their game the liberty and fortunes of others."

Voltaire versus Pascal & Co

Having finished with what Dr. Littledale is pleased to call the "political hostility" to the Jesuits, let us take up some of the most prominent charges against them on moral and doctrinal grounds. The assault made on their moral theology in the famous "Provincial Letters" of Blaise Pascal, issued from Jan., 1656, to March, 1657, is the poisoned source from which the anti-Jesuit literature of the day is drawn. Of Pascal's productions, Voltaire, assuredly no friend of the Jesuits, wrote thus:—

"In good faith, is it by the ingenious satire of the *Letters* "*Provinciales* that the morality of the Jesuits must be judged, and not "rather by the teaching of Père Bourdaloue, of Père Cheminais, and other "preachers, and by their missionaries? Let any one draw a parallel be-

" tween the *Lettres Provinciales* and the sermons of Père Bourdaloue. In " the first may be learnt the science of raillery, the skill of presenting " things indifferent in themselves under a criminal aspect, and the art of " insulting with eloquence. From Père Bourdaloue a man will learn to " be severe to himself, indulgent towards others. I ask, then: On which " side is true morality, and which book is most useful? I venture to say " that nothing can be more iniquitous, more contradictory, more disgrace- " ful to humanity, than to accuse of lax morality men who in Europe lead " the most austere lives, and who seek death in the distant regions of Asia " and America."*

Of the "*Monita Secreta*," to which reference has already been made, professing to be the authoritative "Secret Instructions" drawn up by Aquaviva, 5th General of the Society, and given by the Superiors of the Company to its various officers and members, the most favorable thing that Dr. Littledale can say is:—"The truth seems to be that, *although both caricature and libel*, it was drafted by a shrewd and keen observer, who seeing *what* the Fathers did, travelled analytically backwards to find *how* they did it, and on what methodical system, *conjecturally* re-constructing the process, and *probably* coming very near the mark in not a few details. * * * It had a wide success and popularity, passing through several editions, and though *declared a forgery*, by a Congregation of Cardinals specially appointed to examine it, has not ceased to be reprinted and credited down to the present time."

What a striking similarity there is betweeen the work of Pascal & Co. and the *Times*' "Parnellism and Crime" forgeries! Like the "Provincial Letters" and the "Secret Instructions," is the so called "Jesuit's Oath," —caricature, libel, and forgery.

Some "Jesuit Maxims"

Dr. Littledale claims that Pascal's censures have been in the main justified by the subsequent teaching of the Society, for "the lax casuistry, which he held up to ridicule has been formally reproduced in the most modern text book on the subject, that of Father Gury. In this and in

*Correspondance, 7 Fev. 1746.

kindred works," he says, "it will be found that the principles of 'justification of means by ends,' and of 'mental reservation' are recognized maxims of the Jesuits." The worthy Dr. pretends to speak whereof he knows. But he does not know in every case. For instance, he has written quite lately a letter to the London *Times*, in which he refers to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and says, with an assurance that is truly admirable, that "although the word (transubstantiation) is retained in Roman Catholic theology, the idea is virtually abandoned by the most Roman of theologians, so that the controversy is obsolete." I quote this latest authoritative pronouncement of his, not necessarily as an evidence of his good faith, but merely to show how much he sometimes knows about Catholic theology.

Now, let us examine the Jesuit theologian, Gury, accused of lax casuistry in holding and inculcating the principle of "justification of means by ends," to wit, that when the end is lawful the means to that end are also lawful. Gury's work is accessible to all. After discussing the nature of morality, and some of the conditions that it presupposes in respect of human acts, he proceeds to treat of the sources of morality, or those principles which assign their specific moral character to human acts or modify them. These sources are three-fold: 1—The object of the act; 2—The circumstances of the act; 3—The end of the act. Having established the existence of each of these principles, Father Gury lays down the following conclusions as resulting from them:

"1—The election of evil means is always evil, but on the contrary it does not follow that the election of good means is always good. Thus, no one is held to be worthy of praise because he abstains from drink out o avarice; and he is to be held culpable who steals money in order to give alms.

2.—Whosoever chooses an honest means to an honest end, performs an act of double honesty, if the honesty of the act in both cases falls within his intention. In like manner, he is guilty of double malice who elects an evil means to an evil end, as for instance, if any one stole money in order to get drunk with it.

3—Whosoever employs an evil means for a good end contracts only the malice arising from the choice of such means, as for instance, if any one told a lie to free his neighbor from danger. So, on the other hand, he who makes use of honest means, contracts only the malice arising from such end.

4.—Whosoever makes use of a means indifferent in itself, that is, not having any specific character of good or evil, in order to a good or a bad end, contracts only the goodness or malice arising from the end proposed."

I could give many passages from Gury's text-book in confirmation of the conclusions just read, to show that this attack upon the moral teaching of the Church is based upon misapprehension and misrepresentation. Although by no manner of means a wealthy man, I can afford to make a fairly liberal offer in the interests of truth. It is this: *A reward of five hundred dollars will be given by me to any one, who shall produce a bona fide passage that will convict the Jesuits, or any Jesuit, or any approved Catholic theologian, of teaching the doctrine that "the end justifies the means," as that maxim is vulgarly understood.* This offer will stand until the 12th day of July next, being the first anniversary of the Jesuits' Estates Bill of Quebec.*

Time will not permit to-night an examination of Gury on the question of "mental reservation," suffice it to say, that, here again, caricature and libel miserably fail to smirch his character as a casuist. Those rigid moralists who affect to be scandalized at the Jesuit principle of "mental reservation," must be filled with holy indignation at the lady who is not "at home" to the caller she does not desire to receive, or the prisoner in the dock who pleads "not guilty" rather than criminate himself for mere truth's sake. Why do they not point the finger of their righteous scorn at such "lax moralists," as Jeremy Taylor, who says: "to tell a lie for charity, to save a man's life, the life of a friend, of a husband, of a prince, of a useful and a public person, hath not only been done at all times, but commended by great and wise and good men;" Milton, who asks: "By which of the commandments is a lie forbidden? You will say, by the

*See Appendix.

ninth. If then my lie does not injure my neighbor, certainly it is not forbidden by this commandment;" Paley, who says, "there are falsehoods which are not lies, that is, which are not criminal," and Johnson, who states, "the general rule is that truth should never be violated; there must, however, be some exceptions. If, for instance, a murderer should ask you which way a man is gone."

Suppression of the Society.

We shall now revert to the history of the Jesuits.

In the second half of the 18th century, the infidel powers behind the Bourbon Courts—the most corrupt in Christendom—governing so-called Catholic countries, conspired to destroy the Society. In France, in Spain, in Portugal, and finally in Austria, their machinations were followed by barbarous cruelty towards its members. Imprisonment, confiscation, death and exile had to be suffered. The reigning Pontiff, Clement XIII., watched with sorrowful alarm the development of this crusade against the Jesuits. He stood alone to defend them; but no human power could hush his courageous voice, which continued to the end to uphold the cause of right. But Clement was already an old man, and on the 2nd February, 1769, in his seventy-eighth year, he died. Now was the hour of the enemy. The Jesuits were defenceless—maligned, threatened and insulted—in the midst of their foes. Defenceless, but brave, resolute and defiant. Instances of human frailty and individual weakness they had indeed furnished—as what society has not?—here at one period, there at another; but, as a body, the Company of Jesus stood before the world as pure and as fervent at the end of two hundred years as in the first glorious days of its institution.

The Conclave for the election of a successor to the deceased Pope opened on the 15th February, and straightway the most infamous intrigues were brought to bear upon its members. Among the Cardinals, De Bernis was the chief offender in this respect. His correspondence reveals, day by day, the dark schemes by which the desires of the Bourbon sovereigns were only too faithfully carried out. No species of bribery, threat, or persuasion was spared to secure the election of a Pope inimical to the

Jesuits. All the Cardinals, however, were not men on whom these villainous tactics could produce the desired effect, and the history of the Conclave of 1769 is redeemed by instances of dignity on the part of prelates (too few in number), who would not sell their conscience, and who courageously defended the Society. Cardinal Ganganelli, a Franciscan monk, was the choice of the Conclave, having first given to the agent of the Spanish Court a written declaration, in which he stated that "The Sovereign Pontiff possessed the right to suppress the Society of Jesus according to the Canon Law, and that it was to be hoped that the future Pope would make every effort to comply with the desire of the Courts." On May 19th he ascended the political throne as Clement XIV. The election over, most of the Cardinals seemed to repent of having suffered themselves to be intimidated, for the new Pope, on consulting them, found a majority completely in favour of the Jesuits. But the infidel ministers of those Catholic Courts would brook no delay in the fulfilment of the *quasi* promise they had extracted from him, aud began to bluster and threaten in order to gain the end in view. It was only then that Clement awoke to a sense of his duty as Head of the Church. With this rude awakening there came a deep feeling of his responsibility, and of the obligations incumbent upon him as Christ's Vicar, and he made strenuous efforts to extricate himself from the false position on which he had so rashly entered. To the demands of Choiseul, the French representative, Clement replied :—

"As for the Jesuits, I can neither blame nor destroy an Institute "which nineteen of my predecessors have praised, especially as the Institute "has been confirmed by the holy Council of Trent ; and, according to "your French maxims, a General Council is above the Pope. If it be "desired, I will assemble a General Council, where all things for and "against the Jesuits may be fairly discussed, and where they themselves "shall be heard in their own defence ; for I owe to them, as to every "religious order, justice and protection. Moreover, the Polish nation, the "kings of Sardinia and Prussia have written to me in their favour. I "should, therefore, by destroying them only content some princes by dis- "pleasing others."

It was too late! He stood alone against the crowned heads of Europe, who, pointing to the bond, mercilessly exacted their pound of flesh. Broken in health and in spirits, and utterly weary of resistance, at last he abandoned the Jesuits to their enemies. The Brief of Suppression was dated July 11, 1773. At 8 o'clock, in the evening of that day, it was made known to the 18th General of the Society, Father Ricci, by the Commission of prelates named for that purpose.

The Brief "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster."

I shall now read from a reliable hand-book,* lately published, on this subject:

"The Brief of Suppression is a valuable document in the history of the Society of Jesus, and it is especially remarkable because, as is observed by Protestant Historian Schoell, 'it condemns neither the doctrine, nor the morals, nor the discipline of the Jesuits. The complaints of the Courts against the Order are the only motives alleged for its suppression.'"

"The Pope begins by alluding to the example of his predecessors in the suppression of various congregations, omitting, however, to state that the forms of justice observed in the case of these congregations were wanting in the case of the Jesuits. Thus, in 1310, the Templars were suppressed by Pope Clement V.; but before the sentence was pronounced the Bishops of Christendom were assembled, the accusations and the defence were carefully examined, and the Templars were individually summoned before provincial councils to be judged. The Jesuits, four centuries later, were suppressed without being informed of the charges against them, and much less allowed to defend themselves."

"It would be too long to give the entire text of the famous Brief. After referring to the religious orders which at different times the Holy See had thought it necessary to abolish, the Pope proceeds to mention, on the one hand, the approbation bestowed upon the Society by many of his predecessors, and, on the other, the dissensions which at various periods had broken out between the Jesuits and the secular clergy. He then enumerates the

*"The Jesuits: Their Foundation and History."

accusations brought forward against the Order, without, however, either confirming or denying them; and lastly, he lays great stress upon the disturbance caused by the existence of the Society, and upon the supplications addressed to him for its suppression. In this last paragraph lies the key note to the Brief. It was a sacrifice to peace, but, as events subsequently proved, a sacrifice made in vain. The Pope concludes by pronouncing the suppression of the Order throughout Christendom, and regulates the details of the execution of the sentence. * * * In Rome, although unfortunately some of the cardinnals and prelates only too faithfully served the interests of the Bourbon Courts against the Society, the testimony of Cardinal Antonelli, one of the most eminent members of the Sacred College, gives ample evidence that this feeling was not universal, and in a report addressed to Pius VI., only two years after the suppression, he thus expresses himself: – "The impartial world recognizes the injustice of the act, and those who do not recognize it must be either blind or else bear a mortal hatred to the Jesuits. What rule was observed in the judgment rendered against them? Were they listened to? Were they allowed to bring forward their defence? Such a mode of proceeding proves that there existed the fear of finding them innocent. As for me, I affirm, without fear of error, that the Brief is null, invalid and iniquitous, and consequently that the Society of Jesus is not destroyed. My assertion is founded on a number of proofs, of which I shall be satisfied with bringing forward a few." The Cardinal then enumerates the reasons which, in his opinion, invalidated the Brief. 1.—When the Pope promised to suppress the Society he was only a private individual, unable to estimate the full consequences of his act. 2.—The Brief was extorted from a man, fettered by his previous engagement, by those whose only object was to ruin the Church. 3.—In this infamous transaction, false promises, criminal threats and open violence were made use of towards the Head of the Church; 4.—The Brief was destitute of the canonical forms requisite in a solemn sentence of this description. It is believed, adds the Cardinal, that Clement XIV purposely neglected these formalities, in order to render the Brief less binding. 5.—In the execution of the sentence the ecclesiastical and civil laws of justice were equally violated. 6.—The sentence rests upon un-

proved accusations, and upon calumnies which it is easy to refute. 7.—The Brief contradicts itself, asserting in one part what it denies in the other. 8.—It contains confused and ambiguous expressions, and in the part relating to the simple and solemn vows the Pope attributes to himself powers that no Pontiff ever claimed. 9.—The motives alleged for the suppression of the Society might, under the same pretext, be applied to every religious order, and the Brief is therefore an instrument prepared for the general destruction of religious orders. 10.—It annuls, as far as it can, a number of Briefs and Bulls, issued by the Holy See and accepted by the Church, without giving the reasons of this sweeping condemnation. 11.—It was a cause of scandal to the Church, and a subject of joy only to infidels, heretics and bad Catholics. "These reasons," continues Antonelli, "sufficiently prove the Brief to be null and invalid, and in consequence the so-called suppression of the Society of Jesus is unjust and irregular."

The Bourbon Constitutions have forever passed away. The monarchs who opposed a Society which was one of the pillars of social order, hastened a revolution which their own corruptions and crimes had long invited. Frederick II. of Russia, possessed a mind of a superior calibre. Writing to his agent in Rome, 13th September, 1773, he says, that he had never found better priests in every respect than the Jesuits, and "I am resolved to retain them in my States." Catherine II. of Russia, did not merely approve of the Society, but gave the strictest orders that they were to remain in her Dominions.

How Clement Died

As might be expected, the Jesuits, against whom accusations of regicide have been constantly brought forward, were charged with having poisoned Clement XIV. To so contemptible an accusation silence is perhaps the best answer. At the same time it may be mentioned, that even Protestant historians, and the enemies of the Jesuits deny it. Thus, in the letters of Gavazzi and Malvezzi, both men who had taken an active part in the suppression, the charge is contradicted; and Frederick of Prussia, writing to D'Alembert, on November 15th, 1774, says: "nothing can be more false than the rumors of the Pope having died of poison.

* * * He often reproached himself for the weakness with which he had sacrificed an order like the Jesuits to the caprice of his rebellious children. * * * During the latter part of his life his temper became gloomy and morose, and this contributed to shorten his days." Moreover, the Pope's physicians, Salicetti and Adinolfi, in an official declaration, asserted that the Pope's death proceeded solely from natural causes; and their testimony was confirmed on oath by Father Marzoni, General of the Franciscans, and the intimate friend of Clement XIV., whom he attended during his last illness.*

Restoration

After darkness—dawn. After death—resurrection. On the 7th August, 1814, at the bidding of Pius VII., the Society of Jesus arose triumphant from the tomb. The terms of the Bull of Restoration are a complete vindication of the suppressed Order. "The Catholic world," it declares, "unanimously demands the restoration of the Society of Jesus. "We daily receive the most earnest petitions to this effect from our vener- "able brethren the Archbishops and Bishops, and from other earnest "persons. * * * We should deem ourselves guilty of great negligence "before God, if, in presence of the perils that threaten Christendom, we "neglected the assistance given to us by God's special providence; and if, "placed at the helm of the bark of Peter, tossed by continual tempests, "we refused to employ vigorous and experienced seamen to master the "waves that threaten every instant to cause destruction and death." The Pope then goes on to re-establish the Society of Jesus throughout the Christian World, and to recommend its members to the protection of temporal princes, as well as to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church.†

The Sons of St. Ignatius in Canada

The early Franciscan or Recollect missioners in Canada, finding that the field was too vast for their powers, applied for the assistance of the French Jesuits, who strong in resources as in energy, would not be compelled to rest on the reluctant support of the civil authorities. Three of

*Ibid. †Ibid.

their Society, Charles Lallemant, Edemond Massé, and Jean de Brebœuf, accordingly embarked, and early in the summer of 1625, Canada beheld for the first time those whose names stand so prominent on her annals, the faithful followers of Loyola.

In his "Popular History of Canada," the Rev. H. Withrow, a clergyman of the Methodist church, relates how the Society which had belted the world with its missions, gained some of its grandest triumphs and exhibited its most heroic spirit in the wilderness of Canada—"Nowhere," he declares, "did the Jesuit missionaries exhibit grander moral heroism "or sublimer self-sacrifice; nowhere did they encounter greater sufferings, "with more pious fortitude, or meet with a more tragical fate than "in the wilderness missions of New France. They were the pioneers of "civilization, the path-finders of empire on this continent. With breviary "and crucifix, at the command of the Superior of the Order at Quebec, "they wandered all over the vast country stretching from the rocky shores "of Nova Scotia to the distant prairies of the Far West; from the regions "around Hudson's Bay to the mouth of the Mississippi River. Paddling "all day in their bark canoes; sleeping at night on the naked rock; toiling "over rugged portages, or through pathless forests; pinched by hunger, "gnawed to the bone by cold, often dependent for subsistence on acorns, "the bark of trees, or the bitter moss to which they have given their name; "lodging in Indian wigwams, whose acrid smoke blinded their eyes, and "whose obscene riot was unutterably loathsome to every sense; braving peril "and persecution, and death itself, they persevered in their path of self-"sacrifice, for the glory of God, the salvation of souls, the advancement of "their Order, and the extension of New France. 'Not a cape was turned, "not a river was entered,' says Bancroft, 'but a Jesuit led the way.'"

Parkman, in one of his works,* graphically describes life at Quebec after the arrival of the Jesuits. "A stranger," he says, "visiting Quebec, "would have been astonished at its air of conventual decorum. Black "Jesuits and scarfed officers mingled at Champlain's table. There was "little conversation, but in its place histories and the Lives of the Saints

* "The Pioneers of France in the New World."

"were read aloud, as in a monastic refectory. Prayers, masses and confes-
"sions followed each other with an edifying regularity, and the bell of the
"adjacent chapel, built by Champlain, rang morning, noon and night.
"Godless soldiers caught the infection, and whipped themselves in penance
"for their sins. Debauched artisans outbid each other in the fury of their
"contrition. Quebec was become a Mission. Indians gathered thither as
"of old, not from the baneful lure of brandy, for the traffic in it was no
"longer tolerated,* but from the less pernicious attractions of gifts, kind
"words, and politic blandishments."

A Simple Case of Restitution

There remains to be said but a few words about the Jesuits' Estates Act of Quebec. The Jesuits' estates were acquired by grants from the Kings of France, by gifts from individuals, and by purchases made by the Jesuits themselves. These estates were confiscated by the Imperial authorities under the reign of George III, in 1800, and were afterwards transferred to the authorities of the former Province of Canada. A large portion of them was, at the time of, and since Confederation, ceded to the Province of Quebec. In all the official documents bearing on the subject, it is asserted that the Government of King George took possession, not by right of inheritance, nor of confiscation, but by right of conquest. Let us briefly examine this aspect of the case, and see if there be any grounds on which to justify the act of the Imperial Government.

In 1760, France lost her Dominion in the New World to the English, who captured Quebec. By the articles of capitulation, it was expressly stipulated that the inhabitants "should be left in possession of their houses, lands, effects and privileges." Canada being a colony by cession, its new masters had a right to impose such laws on it as they chose, *subject to any treaty that might be had between the contending parties.* In February, 1763, the Treaty of Paris was signed, and by it the people of Canada were confirmed in their enjoyment of those rights and privileges granted by the Articles of Capitulation.

This establishes the important fact that the terms of the Treaty of

*A point for the Dominion Alliance.

Paris and of the Capitulation did not give to the English Government any right of proprietorship over the property of the Jesuits. The rights of conquest then, as now, conferred, the right of government, or superior dominion, but not of proprietorship.

The opinions and theories here advanced are substantiated by those who had personal and practical knowledge of the question. The Legislative Council of 100 years ago, *whose members were appointed by the Crown*, declared that the Crown could not confiscate these estates without abolishing the Order. It is true, that in 1773 the Pope suppressed the Order of the Jesuits, but this suppression did not confer any rights on the British Government, because the Order had not been officially suppressed in Canada. The illegality of taking possession is therefore clearly established. As was said by an eminent Quebec Jurist, "The act of confiscation was an act of spoliation."

That the right of possession is not based on the right of conquest, is demonstrable in another way. If it had been proposed to confiscate the property of each inhabitant, by virtue of such right, there would have been a mighty cry of grief and protest from one end of the Province to the other. That cry would have been heard in Europe; and though miserable her condition at the time, France would not have permitted this wholesale robbery. Nay, more: the people themselves would not have submitted to it. They would have denounced the attempt; they would have held public meetings to condemn it; and if their peaceful protests proved unavailing they would have armed themselves to resist it. The thing would have been impossible. Why then should that which was impossible in the case of a whole population, have been attempted in the case of a few Religious who had not the same means of opposition and resistance? No satisfactory answer can be given. Indeed, only one answer is possible; and it is of such a factious character that not even a Toronto School Inspector would be stupid enough to make use of it. Therefore, when the Imperial Government declared in 1800, that they took these estates by right of conquest, they invoked a right which did not exist. They violated the terms of Capitulation and of the Treaty of Paris, and infringed the rights of man.

Justice, long-delayed, is about to be done by the Jesuits' Estates Act. The main provisions of this Act, at least those which have chiefly evoked public discussion, are: 1st—That the Quebec Government will pay $400,000 in compensation for the confiscated estates, which sum is to be distributed within the Province as the Pope may suggest; 2nd.—That the agreement will be binding only when ratified by the Pope.

As regards the amount to be paid, great diversity of opinion exists. Some claim that it is too great; others that it is too small. Neither objection can very well be sustained. One approximate value of the Jesuits' estates places them at $1,200,000; another at $2,000,000. In the face of such estimates, $400,000 can not be regarded as excessive. It is but one-half of the actual value of only one of the properties which the Jesuits bought with their own money. Then there are those who say the sum is too small, While this may be true in point of fact, it loses its force when taken in connection with previous negotiations. In 1884, when Cardinal Taschereau was authorized to treat with the Government of the Province of Quebec, $400,000 was the sum agreed on between his Eminence and the Leader of the Government. This being so, a larger sum could not well be demanded now.

But it is asked why should the distribution of this amount be left in hands of the Pope? To this the Quebec Government replies: "Because we do not wish to distribute it ourselves. Besides the Jesuits there are other institutions claiming to be entitled to a portion of this sum according to ecclesiastical law. With the merits of such claims we cannot be expected to deal. Then there are controversies between the Jesuits and Laval University into which it would not become us to enter. To attempt such a thing would be to irritate the uneasiness we seek to allay. We have chosen what appears to us the wiser and safer course. In leaving the distribution of the money in the hands of the Pope all possibility of conflict between the Civil and Religious authorities will thus be avoided. He will distribute this sum like a kind father, anxious only to secure the peace and happiness of his children by rendering justice to each. He will give it to whom he wishes. But on one condition—that the amount fixed as

compensation shall be expended exclusively in the Province." However, what has been so far discussed are but minor objections. The proposal "that the agreement will be binding only when ratified by the Pope," has called forth the most vehement denunciation, and excited many bitter controversies. The discussion has assumed a two-fold aspect. It is asserted that the Legislature should not consent to have one of its Acts sanctioned by a foreign power; that this is a degrading and humiliating position to occupy. The statement is not a fair one. It is misleading. In all important treaties negotiated by an agent or attorney, ratification by the principal is necessary. The agreement under discussion is a case in point. Father Turgeon, who conducted negotiations with the Government, is only the agent or representative of the Holy See. Bearing this in mind, all the Quebec Government propose is, that after the Act has passed the Legislature, the Pope, as one of the two principals, will be asked to ratify it so as to prevent further discussion, and that the matter may thus be finally and authoritatively settled.

In the second place, we are told that Protestants cannot, will not, accept the Pope as arbiter. They will not, cannot, be injured by acceding to this proposal. A few years ago, complications arose between Spain and Germany respecting the ownership of certain islands. The two Governments had begun to make preparation for war, when it was suggested to refer the question to an arbitrator. But to whom? The man selected must be a disinterested party, and one whose nicety of judgement would ensure justice to both the rival powers. The Pope's mediation was invited, and Leo effected an amicable settlement of the difficulty. Even Bismark, —the man of Iron and Blood, the persecutor of Catholics, the opponent of the Papacy—congratulated the Pope on the success of his intervention. Now, why should the Protestants here be more susceptible on this question than the Protestants of Germany on the other? In this case the Government merely propose to make restitution; and it is only reasonable that the Religious Authorities should have a voice in the matter, since it is to them restitution is to be made.

That the Act is just and equitable no honest man can deny. It

should commend itself to every fair-minded Canadian, if for no other reason than that it is the recognition of a debt, due these men who consecrated their lives to the cause of civilization, and shed their blood with such heroic devotion in defence of religion and humanity.

Disreputable Tactics.—Does the End Justify the Means?

The failure that has thus far attended the efforts of the anti-Jesuit agitators to obtain the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act, is no doubt chiefly due to the spirit of fair play that so largely prevails among intelligent Canadians of every creed, and which prompts them to frown upon and discountenance, quietly, but effectively, the disreputable tactics, so unscrupulously resorted to, in the press, on the platform, and even in the pulpit. Every man who loves truth, justice and fair play, will recoil in disgust from a propagandism that is obliged to resort to such fraudulent means as this.—I shall instance but one out of hundreds at hand—to secure a following :—

In the Toronto *Mail* of the 14th February, under such startling headlines as these : "JESUIT PRINCIPLES—INTENTION OF THE POPE TO POSSESS THE COUNTRY," a letter is published, in which we read, among other mendacious and mischievous assertions, that "The Roman hierarchy declares to the "people of the United States (and this applies in like manner to Canada) "the following determination, through its chief organ in this country, "namely, *Brownson's Review* :—'The Church is a kingdom and a power, and "as such must have a supreme chief (the Pope), and this authority is to be "exercised over States as well as individuals. If the Pope directed the "Roman Catholics of this country to overthrow the constitution, sell the "nationality of the country, and annex it as a dependent province to "Napoleon the Little (a Papist sovereign), they would be bound to obey. "It is the intention of the Pope to possess this country.'"

I turn to "*Brownson's Quarterly Review*" for a repudiation of this alleged policy, and find it prompt, plain and unequivocal. It is in the Vol. of 1854-5, in the 2nd article on "The Know-Nothings :"—

"A friend in Raleigh, North Carolina, sends us the following slip from "a newspaper ;—

'If the Pope directed the Roman Catholics of this country to over-
"throw the constitution, to sell the nationality of the country to a
"sovereign state, and annex it as a dependent province to Napoleon the
"Little's crown, they would be bound to obey—*Brownson's Review, by*
"*authority of the Archbishop of Boston.*'

"We suppose there are people in the country, not under guardianship,
"who can believe, not only that we wrote this, but that such is the real
"doctrine of the Church. Now, we never wrote one word of it,
"nor anything from which in can be logically inferred. We sup-
"pose we go as far in asserting the Papal power as any Catholics
"in the world, but we hold no such doctrine as is here ascribed to us.
"We believe the Pope is the divinely appointed judge of the law of God
"for all Catholics, but not the temporal ruler of states. The constitution
"of the United States is not repugnant to the law of God, and is one
"which the people of the United States under that law had a perfect right
"to establish, and, therefore, the Pope has and can have no right to command
"its overthrow. It is idle to speculate what Catholics would be bound to
"do, in case he should command it, because every Catholic knows that he
"can never command it. As for annexing our country to the Crown of
"Napoleon the Little, or Napoleon the Big, it is sufficient to add that
"'when the sky falls, we shall catch larks.' The Papal power lies in the
"spiritual order, and if he can interfere in temporal matters at all, it is
"only in the respect in which they are spiritual, and then not for the
"destruction, but for the protection of the rights of individuals and
"nations."

Well, what do you think of the means adopted by the *Mail* & Co: to provoke hostility against the Jesuits? *Does the end justify the means?*

APPENDIX.

At the evening service, Sunday, March 3, Father Whelan said :—

Last Sunday, I made, in the interests of truth, a liberal offer to the anti-Jesuit agitators, who, in the press, on the platform and in the pulpit —more shame for them !—are, like the Know-Nothings of forty years ago, feeding the prejudices and passions of a class of ignorant Protestants, with lies and calumnies, slanders and libels, most foul, most scandalous, and most cowardly. Yes, most cowardly ; for they dare not accept the challenge uttered last week—they will not dare accept it, no matter in what terms it may be repeated. * * *

I now renew the offer :—FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS *will be paid by me to any one who shall produce a bona-fide passage that will convict the Jesuits, or any Jesuit, or any approved Catholic theologian, of teaching the doctrine that* "THE END JUSTIFIES THE MEANS," *as that maxim is vulgarly understood —i.e.,* " THAT IT IS LAWFUL TO DO EVIL THAT GOOD MAY COME."

There is not going to be any back-down on our part. Let us have an " independent tribunal" by all means. What have the anti-Jesuits to say to this proposal :—A Commission of Inquiry, to be composed, say, of five members : we to select two competent moral theologians ; the other side to appoint two representatives ; these four to choose the fifth member of the Commission. Let a day be fixed for the opening of the Inquiry ; and let it be agreed, that all passages to be cited from Jesuit authors, or other approved Catholic casuists, shall be fyled with the Commission, at least thirty days before the Inquiry begins ; two copies of each passage or extract to be supplied, with the title and the edition of the work, as well as the page, from which it is said to be taken.

I shall abide by the report of the Commission, and shall pay five hundred dollars as promised, to the claimant, should the decision be adverse to me. If a Court of Inquiry, constituted as proposed, be not satisfactory to the anti-Jesuits, then, let them suggest a tribunal. We are not afraid of the issue ; and a course of Catholic ethics would do those people much good. * * *

Their attacks are levelled, not at any special or singular doctrines of the Jesuits, but at the moral teaching of the Catholic Church. These slanders are older than the Jesuit Order. They are as old as the Church itself. In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (c. iii), the Apostle complains of being libelled against in this manner : " We are slandered, as some affirm that we say, ' let us do evil that there may come good.' " Slandered ! Good Paul ! And why not ! " If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household."